

#6 B (NE)
12/2/02
AMZT.S.
1/15/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of **Bechtel et al**
Serial No.: **09/806,560**
Filed: **03/30/2002**
Title: **PLASMA DISPLAY SCREEN HAVING A REFLECTION LAYER**

Atty. Docket No.: **PHD 99-103**
Group Art Unit: **2875**
Examiner: **Dong, Dalei**

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

FAX RECEIVED

DEC 02 2002

Amendment/Reply to Office Action**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**

Sir:

Enclosed is a reply in the above-identified application in response to the Office Action dated 4 September 2002.

Please replace the ABSTRACT, in its entirety, with the attached replacement abstract.

REMARKS

The Abstract is replaced in accordance with the comments of the Examiner.

The Office Action includes a rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Wada et al. (USP 4,692,662, hereinafter Wada). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The applicants specifically teach and claim a plasma display screen having a reflective layer that contains a non-metallic powder having a refractive index of $n = n_{\text{real}} + ik$, where $n > 1.3$ and $k < 0.05$, for the wavelength range from 147nm to 700nm.

The applicants respectfully maintain that each of the compositions taught by Wada for use in the reflective layer have a refractive index with a complex component (k) that is substantially larger than 0.05 within the range of 147-700nm. As is known in the art, the complex component (k) of the refractive index defines the absorption properties of the material, and Wada's choice of material will result in substantially more absorption of light, particularly in the ultraviolet spectral range (UV, less than 400nm). }